

A SOCIALIST COMMENTARY ON COLONIAL AFFAIRS

Venture

JOURNAL OF THE FABIAN COLONIAL BUREAU

VOL. 3 No. 12

JANUARY, 1952

MONTHLY 6d

Comment

Incorporating *Empire*

SOUTH-WEST AFRICAN DISASTER

WHAT is to become of the Africans of South-West Africa if the present deadlock persists between South Africa and the United Nations? At the time of writing, Herero chiefs and headmen—one of them a man of 84 whose life has been spent in watching injustices done to his people—wait patiently at Windhoek while the General Assembly of the United Nations and South Africa indulge in unprofitable controversies over jurisdiction. The International Court of Justice has already in 1950 tendered to the General Assembly its advisory opinion that, while South Africa is not bound to place South-West Africa under trusteeship, it is bound to submit information and petitions to the United Nations in accordance with the procedure of the former Mandates system. South Africa has not a shred of justification for refusing to do this, and had indeed made a move in that direction by offering to negotiate a new agreement for the administration of South-West Africa with the Powers (Britain, France and the United States) which originally bestowed the mandate on the Union. Now one Committee of the General Assembly (not the *ad hoc* committee which was set up to work out with South Africa an acceptable procedure for implementing the World Court's decision) has called for the personal attendance of petitioners to state their case, and South Africa has stumped out of the Assembly in defiance and in protest against the passing of a resolution which exceeds the verdict of the International Court. Nobody in the world sympathises with South Africa in her attitude towards her own non-European peoples, towards South-West Africa and towards the United Nations. It should surely be possible for the case to be handled by the United Nations in such a way that this attitude cannot in any way be excused by an appeal to the rules of the Organisation. After all, everybody

wants to see a body of international law built up and upheld by strong international machinery. Everybody wants justice and protection for the people of South-West Africa. Neither South Africa nor the General Assembly can have it both ways, and it is high time that public opinion made it clear that a workable settlement is more important than high-level squabbles over jurisdiction and injured pride.

TSHEKEDI GOES HOME

THERE has been a general welcome for Lord Ismay's decision to allow Tshekedi Khama to return to the Bamangwato Reserve in Bechuanaland. The return is not without conditions, but these are conditions which it is within the power of Tshekedi himself to flout or to observe—unlike the previous condition that he should be allowed to return if he proved acceptable to the tribe. In his statement on December 6, the Under-Secretary of State said in the House of Commons that Tshekedi must refrain from taking part, directly or indirectly, in the native administration of the Reserve, as he had already offered to do, and when he has thus demonstrated to the tribe that he is willing to be only a private person, he should be allowed to live freely at home. At all times, Mr. Foster said in reply to Mr. Clement Davies, he will have the full protection of H.M. Government. Lord Ismay has taken this decision against the advice of the three observers whom his predecessor sent to the Reserve. Whether he is right in his judgment that his policy can in practice be operated remains to be seen. It is rumoured that a strong attempt will now be made to develop democratic native councils leading to the establishment of a Legislative Council for the whole of Bechuanaland. We have already expressed our view (in *Venture*, August, 1951) that this course should be pursued, and Mr. Gordon-Walker while

in office had already embarked on the preliminary work in regard to local councils. Mr. Foster's statement that H.M. Government wish to take advantage of 'the very outstanding abilities of Mr. Tshekedi Khama' has given rise to reports that it is in the wider field of the affairs of the whole territory that he may be given an opportunity of service. Seretse Khama remains, however, in London, and is not at present to be allowed to return as Chief or in a private capacity. If peace is now restored amongst the Bamangwato, and time is given for animosities to die, a way may be opened for the return of Seretse also.

WHAT IS A MINISTER ?

A CORRESPONDENT has rightly drawn our attention to the fact that in our comment last month on the British Guiana constitution it was implied that 'Ministers' in Jamaica under the 1944 constitution had the same powers as Ministers in the Gold Coast. This is not, of course, the case. Up till now, one of the greatest weaknesses of the Jamaican constitution has been the absence of individual ministerial responsibility. The Jamaican Ministers have not exercised complete responsibility in their departments and carried authority, in that capacity, in the legislature. It is just this weakness that the new constitutional changes in Jamaica are designed to eliminate. It is all the more to be regretted, therefore, that the same weakness appears in the new Nigerian Constitution,* where it may lead to serious trouble in the future. This danger has been triumphantly avoided in the Gold Coast, where individual Ministers carry the full burden of responsibility for their departments on their own shoulders.

This is not a remote constitutional question of importance only to experts. It is a matter of supreme importance to electors that they should be able to judge the performance of their Ministers without any doubt arising as to the true allocation of responsibility. It is also of importance to them that they should be able to judge the performance of a Government as a whole. This can be done without error only when it is obvious that Ministers are genuinely working together on a common policy, and it is at this point that the question of their membership of political parties becomes relevant. Nigeria suffers at present from the absence of one party which can, as in the Gold Coast, be clearly understood to carry weight throughout the whole country. This weakness can be removed only if the parties them-

selves are able to arrive at satisfactory methods of working the constitutional machinery at present provided—a task which must be for them extremely difficult and which will require the greatest possible measure of tact and responsibility from all concerned. An example which their circumstances do not allow them to follow, but which is well worth their attention, is that of Sierra Leone. Sierra Leone has completed its elections and Sir George Beresford Stooke has already appointed six unofficial Members of Executive Council. All six are members of the Sierra Leone People's Party, which won the election, and which stands for the unity of the Colony and the Protectorate in one Sierra Leone. British Socialists will hope that the other West African territories will also recognise that Sierra Leone has made history in the appointment to its Executive Council of a highly-respected and able trade union leader in the person of Mr. Siaka Stevens, whose career has been followed with growing admiration and affection by his many friends in our own Labour movement.

PARTNERSHIP

THE dead hand of tradition continues to lie heavy on Central Africa. Europeans have been accustomed to talking politics to Europeans. Africans have been accustomed to talk with Africans. And so, it seems, they must go on for all eternity unless some official agency brings them together in a Legislative Council or a conference of some kind. But talk together *unofficially* round a table? That seems to be beyond the horizon of these troubled lands. What God has put asunder, it seems to be felt, let no man join together. Yet it is of prime importance to both sides that they should find a way to come together. How regrettable, therefore, that explosive speeches should still be made on the spot, and that so little should apparently be done to give reality to the statement of Sir Godfrey Huggins which we reprint on Page 7. How regrettable that Mr. Oliver Lyttelton should have flouted African opinion in his manner of giving a 'lead' on Central African Federation! And how natural, considering what has gone before, that Africans should now be showing distrust of the whole idea of partnership, considering as they do that it is inseparably linked with the attempt to compel them to agree to a Federation which they do not want! Yet Federation and Partnership are not two facets of the same thing. Whether or not the three territories of Central Africa federate, a path to partnership must still be found if the two races are to avoid growing bitterness and distrust.

* See *Venture*, August, 1951, page 7.

and this number has now increased. These staffs It is for this reason that we shall continue to publish contributions to the discussion of the question *What is Partnership?* That is a question that still has to be answered in East as well as Central Africa. Nobody suggests that it can be answered in definite detail down to the smallest circumstance of inter-racial contact. But it must be answered, and in a radical sense. Nothing would give us greater pleasure than to be able to print a constructive suggestion from a responsible European leader, but so far, we have seen only nebulous statements or speeches couched in the familiar derogatory terms. As long as this is so, it is quite useless to talk of 'bringing down to earth' the Africans who denounce the whole objective. The Europeans, one African wrote to the press some months ago, 'do not sit with us in the evening when we talk about the future of our people.' Yet that is the final solution to the problem.

THE 'FOREIGN FIRMS'

THE news that the Shell D'Arcy Company 'have good hopes that petroleum deposits do exist' in Eastern Nigeria is bound to give rise to some anxiety as well as to great expectations for the country's economic future. The Company has already spent £1½m., some of it on amenities. Young Nigerians are being trained, there is a good playing field, and a staff club which will be open to European and African workers alike will be ready, it is reported, in a few months' time. Villages along a four-mile water-line are now benefiting from a supply of clean water, and the Company's location is well-planned. The Company has gone out of its way to publicise its work by showing round visitors from the press, and its spokesmen have referred to the 'friendly and co-operative spirit of the local people.' Yet the example of Persia indicates that some thought should be given as soon as possible to the implications of the recent announcement. Nigerian politicians are now to have a very large measure of responsibility for running their own country, and it is up to them to work out a policy on foreign investment before the question becomes an issue in international relations.

In this, the experience of the newly-independent countries in Asia may be of value. On Page 4, Mr. H. E. Castens, who has frequently written on the problem of the 'foreign firms' in this journal, examines a United Nations report which shows the attempts that these Asian countries are making to match their political independence with economic strength. Nigerians may find some

guide in the new agreement made in Burma, where a local company is to be formed with a capital of £15m. in which the shares will be held jointly by the Burmese Government and the Burmah Oil Company. The British Government is lending Burma £2½m. to enable her Government to buy its shares. Or there may be something of value in the experience of India. The manager of the Calcutta Branch of the Standard Vacuum Oil Company spoke some weeks ago of the changes that had taken place there since the day, before independence was granted, when he 'watched a crowd surge up and down the main thoroughfare [of Calcutta], breaking the plate-glass windows of European stores.*' In India today foreign business men are able to operate, under the controls laid down by the Indian Government on dividends and profits remitted abroad, and are treated much the same as Indian firms. If millions of pounds are now to be invested in West Africa, whether in oil or in the Volta Scheme, it would doubtless save much trouble in the future if thought could be given now to the terms on which West Africa wishes to receive the money.

HIGHER EDUCATION

THE debate on higher education in the Colonies initiated by Mr. James Johnson in the House of Commons on December 7 brought out something of the achievement as well as some of the difficulties of the colonial Universities. The Universities of Hongkong and Malaya have made great strides since the Japanese occupation during the war, the West Indies have established a new University College of their own, while in East and West Africa, and at Khartoum, existing institutions have been elevated to University status. This is no mean achievement. It has been made possible by grants from this country, from the local Governments of the territories concerned, and by some generous private donations. There is one serious gap, in Central Africa, where a Rhodesian University is still the subject of discussion. The debate brought forth a number of tributes to persons who are doing outstanding work—such as Mr. Robert Gardiner in Nigeria—but the full reports of the Inter-University Council can alone paint the whole picture. The Council's Report for 1949-50 showed that there were then, outside the Royal University of Malta, where much of the teaching is undertaken by part-time staff, nearly 400 senior full-time staff employed,

* *Far Eastern Survey* of the American Institute of Pacific Relations, November 7, 1951.

have been drawn from the United Kingdom and the Dominions, from the Colonies themselves, and from non-English speaking countries. It is refreshing to find that the world-wide tradition inherent in the very name of a university is already beginning to take root, as the growing proportion of locally-recruited staff (already significant in Malta, Malaya and Hongkong) is supplemented by West Indians teaching in West Africa and by recruits from Poland, Germany, Denmark, Switzerland and Holland.

There still remain, however, many problems. All the Universities and University Colleges need more money, particularly Makerere College in Uganda. Mr. Johnson asked whether some of the unallocated funds of the Coffee and Cotton Marketing funds in East Africa could not be donated to Makerere, as large sums have been donated to the West African Colleges by the Cocoa Boards. He drew attention to the absence

of an extra-mural department, which, if West African and West Indian experience is any guide, would amply repay the expenditure. Mr. Alport made his usual determined plea for more women's education, and Colonel Elliot stressed the need for first-rate teachers in technical education.

Naturally, the debate raised more questions than it answered. But one answer was given which may foreshadow the end of a dreary and humiliating controversy which has long engendered bitterness in East Africa. Mr. Lennox-Boyd announced that the General Medical Council has three visitors at Makerere at present, who are trying to see whether its Diploma can be recognised. If it is recognised, the holders of the Diploma will be able to practise anywhere in the world. Makerere has also broken new ground in the admission of a small number of non-African students—a number which everyone must hope will grow.

HELP FOR UNDERDEVELOPED COUNTRIES

It is now generally accepted that in the large areas of the world commonly termed 'the underdeveloped countries' heavy expenditure is required if the standards of living of the people are to be raised. Where are the money, the materials, and the technicians to come from? Can and will these areas finance their own development? Can and will existing international machinery help them? And what will be the social consequences? In the following article a correspondent considers two recent United Nations publications with these questions in mind:

I. UNO on Domestic Financing

THE recent UNO publication *Domestic Financing of Economic Development** is of great importance to socialists interested in the future development of the underdeveloped countries. It is so for two main reasons.

The first of these is that it gives a picture, partly inferential but none the less definite, of the sort of culture that is being changed, of the manner in which the change is being compassed, and of the sort of culture that the change is aimed at producing. The second arises from the manner of its preparation. The discussions leading up to this were held by members of the staffs of the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, and the Secretariat of UNO; together with seven experts from Chile, Egypt, India, Mexico, the Philippines, Puerto Rico, and the British Treasury. These outside experts were thus mostly from countries hoping for Fund and Bank dollars in a large way, while one of them (the Indian) was a Fund official. In these circumstances the publication can be regarded as an almost official exposition of fundamental policy thinking in International Monetary Fund, World Bank, and UNO

circles.

The typical under-developed country appears (by inference) to be a country with an almost primitive and desperately poor rural community on which a small but efficient foreign exploiting organisation (complete with its own financial system) has been superimposed. Around this foreign nucleus a native bourgeoisie has collected. Varying stages of development between countries seem largely to be a function of the state of growth of this bourgeoisie.

Although in some more advanced countries (e.g. India) the native middle class seeks some of its profits from productive enterprises, characteristically it uses all its available funds (that is, all the mobile capital of the native community) to enrich itself from unproductive transactions in trade, moneylending, landowning, etc.; and no moral considerations of social need can persuade it to do likewise. The experts spent a lot of time in unhelpful enumeration of possible financial means of persuasion, but they were forced to accept the fact that nearly all productive investment for which foreign funds are not available must be made by local Governments out of the proceeds of taxation. They were in no doubt that this process, carried out according to circumstances

* UN Publication Sales No.: 1951 II B 1. 11/-.

through Government departments or through specialised and publicly owned credit and development organisations, would succeed.

So far, so good. Money harnessed to greed has completely failed to carry out essential social tasks, so some of it is taxed away, harnessed to public service, and does the work successfully. The socialist, who always said this must happen in such circumstances, now looks for a discussion as to how this successful change in organisation can first be consolidated and then extended further. He finds instead a detailed discussion of possible techniques and timings for handing over to private owners the successful profit-making enterprises that have been developed by public service, and for taking further steps leading to the perfect capitalist society complete with stock exchange and a large internal national debt.

There are allusions in the report to the possibility that some countries might not want to reach this goal; but their rarity, the complete absence of any attempt to discuss the problems of socialist development and the exhaustive treatment of all other problems of domestic finance combine to throw a brilliant light on the assumptions and desires of the circles from which it emanated. These, it must be emphasised, are the circles from or through which most foreign help to underdeveloped countries is likely to come.

II. Asia on Foreign Private Investment

A recent UNO publication is the contrast it reveals between this UNO thinking and that of the non-colonial countries of East and South Asia. *Foreign Investment Laws and Regulations of the Countries of Asia and the Far East** was intended to be a guide to private investors for all countries from Pakistan to Japan, but information about Brunei, Sarawak, Hongkong, China and Indonesian Indonesia was not available. Study of the laws, etc., of the remainder shew that (except the anomalous cases of Japan and Korea) the countries fall into two groups; those that are still Colonies or quasi-Colonies of the Western powers, and those that have recently made material progress towards losing that status. The first group consists of Indo-China, Malaya, Singapore, North Borneo and Thailand, all of whose foreign investment laws belong to the era when the functions of races and nationalities in the Far East were as separate and immiscible as those of the Hindu Castes. Consequently these laws contain no material limitations on foreign activities in fields not traditionally native, no material provisions to

secure the training of natives in traditionally foreign occupations, and no suggestion that any of those key parts of the economies now entirely in foreign hands might be transferred to the ultimately native ownership of the State. Indeed in Malaya, even after several years of Labour suzerainty, any such possibility is denied with emphasis that is almost derisive.* In the second group (Burma, Ceylon, India, Nepal, Pakistan, and the Philippines) the 'caste' system is legally shattered, and the potential ability, the right and the power of nationals to carry out work hitherto carried out by foreigners is emphasised. This emphasis has both nationalist and socialist aspects. The national aspect appears in laws insisting on a minimum (generally majority) share of the capital and direction of all new concerns being reserved for nationals, in laws insisting on the training and early employment of nationals in technical and administrative work, and in laws insisting on the employment of nationals as a labour force. Most countries have provisions for relaxing these rules where enough local money and skill cannot be found for desirable developments, but all clearly intend these to be of temporary use only. Even the Philippines, which have lifted almost all restrictions against Americans, have done so till 1974 only. All countries, either in their constitutions or in declarations of policy, insist on the right of the nation to own anything within its boundaries. Burma's constitution lays down that it is to be a socialist state, and India intends ultimate public ownership of a very wide range of activities. In all cases except the Philippines, the share of public ownership intended goes far beyond starting development and then getting out. Only the Philippines are restricting their use of far wider constitutional powers to such activities.

These laws and regulations give the impression that (with the possible temporary exception of the Philippines) the countries of this group have mapped out for themselves an independent and prosperous, and largely socialist, future that they intend to reach. Though prepared both to receive and give help on the road, past experience will make them look pretty carefully at each outstretched hand to see that it is not reaching to drag them aside or backwards. If UNO is to extend a helping hand, socialists will need to work hard to alter the trend of current thought.

H. E. CASTENS.

* 'No nationalisation of foreign enterprise was contemplated at present and, in the unlikely event of this occurring, there would certainly be compensation for property nationalised.' (*Author's italics.*)

* UN Publications Sales No. 1951 II F 1. 5/-.

The following comment on the statement on Partnership in Central Africa published in our December number is contributed by a reader:

THE statement on Partnership published in your December issue should constitute the beginning of some precise and constructive thinking in the Labour movement on this most vital aspect of colonial policy. In broad outline, it is an admirable statement, but could, in my opinion, do with clarification here and there, as well as with some additions.

Two sections that should be clarified are:—

(i) *The Executive Council.* This section should be amended so as to read: 'At least one African unofficial . . . to serve on the Executive Council.' Nothing should stand in the way of increasing African representation on the Executive Council. Indeed, it may be necessary at some distant date to provide that at least one European unofficial be chosen to serve on it!

(ii) *Fundamental Rights?* Sub-section (b) is not clear. It seems to mean that a given view on any question shall be accorded the same weight, no matter to what race the person holding that view belongs. If this is to be merely a pious declaration of intellectual non-discrimination, then there is little point in including it. If it is to be something more, then it may not be advisable that we be committed to it. When one group of people is being raised to the level of another, action is often necessary which will affect the groups to very different degrees, and such a clause might interfere with a progressive native policy. It cannot be too often emphasised that an attempt, in any sphere of politics, to maintain an impartial balance between the 'haves' and the 'have-nots' is the surest way possible of consolidating the inequality between them.

'Alleged infringement of these fundamental rights may be actionable at law.' Does this mean that a *civil* action may lie, and if so is this to replace or to supplement criminal proceedings?

Here are some additional points that I should like to see included in a statement defining Partnership:—

(i) *Concealed discrimination.* The type of abuse that I have in mind is well illustrated by the raising, earlier this year, of the property qualification required by the electoral law of Southern Rhodesia—an action discriminatory in its intention and in its effect, but not in its form. To deal with this kind of thing, which may become more widespread in the future, a clause should be inserted making it clear that wherever any type of racial discrimination is declared to be unlawful, any action shall be unlawful if it *in fact* results in discrimination of that type, notwithstanding that in form and in ostensible motive the action does not appear to be directed towards the creation or maintenance of such discrimination.

(ii) *Land.* A clause defining the principles of land allocation should be included, although I do not feel competent to suggest the exact form which it should take.

(iii) *Penal Sanctions for Breach of Employment Contracts, and Pass Laws.* Both these should be declared to be due for speedy abolition. (An I.L.O. Committee of Experts has just recommended that penal sanctions in employment contracts be abolished by December 31, 1955.)

(iv) *Education.* Equal educational opportunities for all races is an ideal which surely deserves mention in a statement on Partnership. It should be made clear

WHAT IS

that every form of education will be expanded as quickly as possible, and that, in particular, elementary and secondary schooling will be made available to all children in the near future.

Partnership is not one relationship but two. It is not merely a relationship between the racial groups inhabiting the colony itself; it is also one between the colonial peoples and the mother-country. If we fail to provide assistance—economic, technical, etc.—of the right type and amount, no constitution or treaty will be of the slightest use. But this fundamental fact is not reducible to a series of formal terms, and to state it again as a general principle would be merely to repeat a platitude that has hardly yet begun to be translated into action. However, within the sphere of individual and group rights, a comprehensive definition of Partnership is both possible and desirable; it is in this sphere, after all, that a change to a more progressive policy will first make itself felt by the colonial peoples. The implementation of such a definition as you advocate would perhaps mark the turning-point in the history of race relations, and might prove to be the beginning of the realisation of One World.

Paul Brodetsky.

In Northern Rhodesia itself, the *Central African Post* published on November 15, 1951, a letter from which the following is extracted:

THE people of this country can neither accept nor reject the policy of partnership at this stage because this policy has never been defined. The word partnership implies a cordial relationship not a relationship of master and servant, nor of oppressor and oppressed. Partnership has been the declared policy of the Colonial Office since 1948. However, the existing relationship between the races in Northern Rhodesia could not be called partnership no matter how far that ambiguous word were stretched. We must therefore assume that the policy of partnership has never been implemented here. If on the other hand, the existing racial relationship is to be called partnership by the Settler and the Colonial Office, then they are merely playing with words, and we must reject a 'Partnership.' What exists here today is European Domination, whose education is really 'un-social.' To call domination by its name of partnership is to call a Lion a Fish. Partnership can be good or bad. It depends on its definitions. It is dangerous to accept a mere word, which will be twisted to suit the purpose of Welensky and Co., who are already talking of Junior and Senior Partners. Supposing the definition of partnership will be based on democratic principles and therefore accepted to Africans, will the mere definition be sufficient? No! mere principles are as worthless and lethal.

Principle 1. To give effect to this principle the Universal Suffrage must be introduced. The existing electoral law must be amended to allow British Protected Persons to become voters without naturalisation. The property qualification must be abolished so that poverty is no bar in participation in the affairs of the country. The separate racial representatives in Legco must be abolished and means provided to enable persons of any race to stand in any constituency. Constituencies must be made of equal size throughout the country. The

TNERSHIP?

communal system of 'representation' must then be abolished. In local government institutions of towns, Africans must be represented in proportion to their numbers. The above does not necessarily mean that only Africans would get into Legco, and Municipal Councils. Many Africans may choose to vote for able and sympathetic Europeans who are at present debarred from Legco because of the monopoly of the vote by the Settler minority. There are many such Europeans but they will never get elected to serve in the interests of all the people until the Africans have the vote. But the above does mean that control of the country's affairs would lie in the hands of the majority of the people and not in the hands of a minority as at present.

Principle 2. To give effect to this principle all forms of colour bar must be outlawed and its practice heavily punished; the colour bar which at present exists in Government Institutions (Post Offices, Government Offices, public libraries, schools) must be discontinued; hospitals and schools must be made to provide common services of all races. The Dalglish Report must be implemented. The Location system must be abolished. The 'Situpa' must be abolished and Africans treated like human beings not like potential criminals. The present poll-tax which makes the poorest African pay direct taxation must be abolished, and a common income tax introduced for all races. This would mean that only those Africans, earning more than £250 per year would have to pay tax. The restriction of the purchase of arms by Africans must be removed. All regulations providing for lower prices for African produce, than for European produce, must be abolished.

The above are the essential first steps to Partnership. If these steps are not accepted in the forthcoming session of the Legco, then they must be fought for after the session—at future sessions of Legco and in the Urban Advisory and Representative Councils. The fight must be taken outside the councils, the steps must be explained to the masses and their support organised. Our fight is for democracy; with the support of the people we cannot fail. Yours, etc.

Rhodesian.

Sir Godfrey Huggins, Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia, devoted part of his speech at Ndola on December 1, 1951, to the subject of partnership.

“It is not fair to say: The native is a child, let him burn his fingers, he will learn from that. Granted, it is the cheaper policy but, apart from the injustice of this policy to the individual native, he may knock something over in the process and burn other people. We do not pretend there is any equality of partnership at the present time, but the native has joined the firm and has his foot on the lower rungs of the ladder. He will have to learn the wisdom of trying to help himself, for we cannot carry the whole of his burden.

“Why have I and many people in Southern Rhodesia adopted this policy? Again, it is not so much “my duty towards my neighbour” that influences us but the study of what happened in Europe when they tried to repress the masses. You will remember the rioting and bloodshed in England the French Revolution and other instances. Let us take the case of the homeland. What was the end of the struggle in a country not given to

revolution? In the end, the representatives of the masses obtained Governmental powers, and with what result? Pushed by the extreme Left, they set about dispossessing the possessing classes and nearly caused the complete eclipse of our homeland. This would never have happened if the great industrialists in Queen Victoria's time had realised that they must share some of their wealth and responsibility with others . . .

“There has been a lot of discussion lately about the exact meaning of partnership. Unfortunately, like many of the “isms” that are quoted from time to time, its exact definition is difficult, if not dangerous. One can at least say that it is based on the total rejection of any policy of racial domination and suppression and a sincere acceptance of the fact that black and white are indispensable to each other, and that each must, by his conduct and actions, earn the confidence and goodwill of the other. That is the attitude of mind in which we endeavour, with varying success, to base our actions. Perhaps the best example of this is our acceptance of a common Parliamentary voters' roll, a principle practically unique throughout the length and breadth of Africa. This phrase has, unfortunately, no particular significance or publicity value in the United Kingdom, despite the fact that it was accepted there only 23 years ago, after a thousand years of evolution. Some cynics say that we are not sincere in this, but it is an established fact of great consequence. We have no hesitation in admitting that for the foreseeable future Government must remain in the hands of the European, who by his training, background and experience is the only possible choice, but we do say to the African, “Here is your chance to prove your worth and to join in the Government of your country.” It is, indeed, the only possible objective and I hope the Africans will not be misled into thinking otherwise . . . We in Southern Rhodesia are proud of what we have done in bringing civilisation to this part of the world and, incidentally, in looking after our African population largely at the expense of the European taxpayer . . . Contrary to popular belief, Southern Rhodesia has worked progressively, advisedly and of set purpose, for the co-operation and advancement of all races in this country. In reality, we already have partnership in embryo, in the sense that we are all of one company in Southern Rhodesia. Consequently, when any approach, however well intentioned, is made to the African direct, or any policy is indicated of leaving him to his own political devices, we are disappointed (we even resent it), not because we would deny the African a voice in his own Government or deny him any benefits of civilised democracy but because to treat him as part of a different country is to suggest that we can never work together in amity. This, in the view of any Southern Rhodesian, whatever his race, is as fundamentally illogical as it is disruptive and disturbing. The success of our policy is due to intimate day-to-day relations between our European Native Affairs Department officials, who, in dealing with the native people, realise that they require leadership but must not be led by the nose . . . We are here tonight through the efforts of one man—Cecil John Rhodes. When we echo his words, “Equal rights for all civilised men,” we do so not merely out of respect for our Founder, we do so in the sincere belief that therein lies the future of Central Africa. We are still left with the great problem, “What is a civilised man?”

[One answer to Sir Godfrey Huggins's last question is given overleaf.—Ed.]

OPINION

Mr. J. M. L. Nkolonganya, of Tabora, Tanganyika, writes to *Mutende*, August 7, 1951:

'FIRST let us make a list of a few of the things we would expect to find in a perfectly civilised country:

1. There would be no need for locks on doors or boxes or bicycles or anything else, because people who are perfectly civilised do not steal.

2. We could believe whatever people told us, because perfectly civilised people do not tell lies.

3. Children will be healthy and happy, people, houses, towns and everything would be clean, because there would be great progress in Education, and people would be working together for the good of all: "Good education creates civilisation."

4. There would be no agitators trying to make people hate each other, because hate leads to fighting and wars which destroy civilisation.

5. People would not be drunkards, because too much drink makes us stupid and unhealthy; drunkenness leads to quarreling, crimes and uncivilised behaviour, and harms not only us but our families and people.

6. People would not worship idols or other things, or other men, but the real God, and believe really as real Christians.

These are just a few of the things we would expect to find in a perfectly civilised country.

Mr. Charles Mzingeli, Secretary of the Reformed Industrial and Commercial Workers' Union, Southern Rhodesia, writes to *Venture*:

I TAKE the opportunity to make some observations on two very interesting articles in your December number. One is headed *The Tories take Over*, the other *What is Partnership?*

I feel that I am expressing an opinion of all responsible African leaders in central Africa, when I say it is the duty of British Government to learn by example of the Government of the Union of South Africa that the federation proposal is a step towards a Central African Dominion, to create a government of white settlers by the white settlers for the whites. The Southern Rhodesia Government have set down all stages of discriminatory measure and the aim to amalgamation of Central Africa is to put a finishing touch. With this fact in view any suggestion as conditions for proposed federation (amalgamation) is in my opinion quite unnecessary.

You have rightly pointed out how Mr. Griffiths was accused by the Southern Rhodesia Leader of Opposition, for negotiations with Natives, but you left another sentence which I think is very important for information of those interested in the principle of democracy. By criticising Mr. Griffiths, the Southern Rhodesia Leader of Opposition felt that Mr. Griffiths should have acted as Cecil John Rhodes did in Matabeleland towards the end of 1900, i.e., Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland should just be taken away from natives. The recent comment of the Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia on the subject of Partnership (see *London Observer*, 2.12.1951) confirm the contention by African leaders that European settlers in Central Africa can only accept a form of partnership made on their own terms, not even terms of master and servant but those of a prisoner's chief warden and a criminal prisoner.

I feel it is not too late for the British Government, and in the light of errors committed by the Southern

Rhodesian Government against the non-discrimination provision in the Southern Rhodesian constitution Letters patent of 1923, to take steps to bring pressure to bear upon the Government of Southern Rhodesia. Not until such time as this Government shall have repealed its apartheid policy, so-called parallel development, would responsible African leaders of Central Africa be prepared to make some genuine suggestions regarding provisions of partnership in the event of federation of the three central African states.

The following critical comment on the work of the Fabian Colonial Bureau is a translated extract from a review of three of the Bureau's pamphlets by Professor Guy Malengreau, of the University of Louvain.

'WHEN the Labour Party came to power in Britain it brought new life into British colonial policy. Leaving aside the new Asian Dominions, and looking only at Africa, it must be recognised that in the last few years the Labour Government has been very active in the colonial field. Provision of funds for economic development, constitutional reforms in British West Africa, replacing of Indirect Rule by Local Government and the founding of University Colleges are some examples of active interest in colonial affairs. The Government has also frankly defended the interests of the native peoples against the demands of white settlers in Rhodesia and East Africa. All this is evidence that the Labour Party leadership thinks about colonial policy, a change from the poverty of thinking, in this field as in several others, revealed by most of the European Socialist Parties.

The basic principles of Labour Party colonial policy were very largely worked out in the Fabian Colonial Bureau. The Bureau, which is independent of the Government, loses no opportunity of expressing its own views on topical issues. The Bureau pamphlets may perhaps be criticised for overstressing political matters while paying far less attention to problems of "civilisation," and for pressing forward too boldly on the path to "Self-government." It is often said that political independence must go together with a certain measure of economic independence, but it is even more true to say that there cannot be genuine democracy as long as the great mass of the population has not achieved a certain cultural standard and a certain degree of moral stability. The main aim of the local government policy to which the British are so devoted is to avoid government by an oligarchy, but without a corresponding effort in the cultural field, this policy may quickly result in native governments at the mercy of an aristocratic minority. When that day comes, the Labour Party may perhaps be held responsible for having carried out an apparently more generous policy which in actual fact will only have replaced colonial paternalism by the paternalism of a native privileged class. No doubt the British are sufficiently realist to know that, historically speaking, certain courses of action once set in motion cannot be arrested; the very most that can even be dreamed of is that these may move on in the desired direction.

We hope that the Fabian Colonial Bureau, to which we owe many interesting publications, will prove that it knows how to fulfil its task of informing not only the British public but also the new élite among the native peoples; maybe it will thus escape being engulfed by the political cross-currents swirling today over the colonial territories.'

Zaire, Vol. V-9. November, 1951.

EL DORADO'S NEW CONSTITUTION

THE new Constitution proposed for British Guiana by the Waddington Commission is the latest in a flurry of new constitutions devised within the last seven years for the British Caribbean.

British Guiana, like the rest of the Caribbean, is economically a markedly underdeveloped area, and it is inhabited by a population as heterogeneous as Ceylon's. Despite more than a century of 'patching and partial reform,' the Commission reported, its constitution was not 'an efficient instrument for serving the growing needs of the country.' Indeed, it was not until 1928 that a Legislative Council on the lines existing elsewhere in the Empire was introduced, and an elected majority was not achieved until 1943.

The essential need of the area was therefore the granting of effective political power, democratically based on universal adult suffrage. Mere power, however, in the hands of any group is potentially dangerous. The task of the Constitutional Commission was therefore to recommend a constitution which would ensure the wise and constructive use of this power to bring about necessary economic advance, to further racial and integration and social happiness in British Guiana and to enable her to fulfil her 'Caribbean destiny,' which the Commission so wisely recognised.

The three-man Commission sent out to receive evidence and present a report was a promising departure. It included an ex-Governor of British Guiana, Sir John Waddington, who acted as Chairman, Professor Vincent Harlow, the constitutional historian, and Dr. Rita Hinden, an experienced writer on colonial problems. In view of the impending implementation of Caribbean federal proposals, it might have been of advantage to have added to these a local Caribbean member, but sober reflection on British Guiana's position makes it clear that better results were likely from an external Commission.

The Commission's Report deals with three major subjects which are likely to be controversial, as well as two others, the judiciary and the civil service, which should not occasion any debate.

i. The Franchise.

The Commissioners agreed on adult suffrage. They argued that literary tests showed only *nominal* literacy, certainly not intelligence, that they discriminated against East Indians, and that universal suffrage had become the general rule in the British West Indies and in British Guiana's local government.

ii. The Legislature.

Here the Commissioners divided. Sir John Waddington supported a unicameral Legislative Council, a further development on the mixed Council established in Trinidad in 1950. Dr. Hinden and Professor Harlow offered a more sweeping change whereby the nominated members would be removed to a separate chamber (State Council) and the elected members remain as a lower house (House of Assembly). The powers of the upper chamber would be severely curtailed both as to the time for which they could delay legislation, and by a provision that the Governor might call a joint session in the event of disagreement.

Both sides presented well-documented cases for their proposals. Sir John felt that economic and racial problems made it advisable, though the phrase is not his, 'to hasten slowly'; nominated moderates would have greater

influence through the personal relationships of one chamber than through ineffectual constitutional checks, and they would be able to influence the election of ministers. The others felt that popular feeling would reject any retention of nomination in the dominant body, and that party government, which Sir John thought improbable, was the *sine qua non* of advance.

iii. The Executive.

Under the double-chamber arrangements proposed by Dr. Hinden and Professor Harlow and supported by the Secretary of State, the Executive Council (now to be known as the Court of Policy) would be the instrument of policy, and Ministers will be elected individually by and be individually responsible to the lower House. The Governor will assign portfolios, and the Ministers will choose the Leader of the House from amongst themselves. The Governor will retain his usual 'discretionary powers of dissent, reservation and declaration.'

These recommendations are based on certain premises. It is held that there is need for the retention of final powers in the hands of the Secretary of State and the Governor, for some means of review within the legislature, and for full-scale operation of democratic machinery at all other times. The scope for conventional development is considerable, and such controls as do exist need not be used if the Governor accepts the Leader of the House's advice on all subjects, as he would normally do. The Commission's differences over the form of the legislature are based on differing analyses of the state of public opinion, and a definite conclusion on their relative merits can be formed only after a period of operation, if then. If one is forced to act only on faith, it is best to grasp the nettle at once.

The Commission has left open a number of problems. Future constitutional relations with a British Caribbean Federation were outside its terms of reference. It could, however, have laid down clearly and emphatically that provision for a literacy campaign (so unwisely snuffed out in Guiana) ought to be made extensively and at once. There are also such questions as the Governor's veto, on which the Commission advised 'rarity,' and the position of the upper house if it should become obstructive or 'mischievous.' The continuance of nomination of members of the legislature, which, if carried out on the basis recommended, would remove the present stigma and enable those qualified to come into political life and perform a service, will not achieve its ends if defeated candidates continue to be nominated. Lastly, the appointment of Ministers should remove some of the frustration which is often felt by civil servants as well as legislators, but a great deal depends on the method of working.

Despite these qualifications, the document is fundamentally remarkable in the history of constitutional development in a non-self-governing multi-racial community—one which has economic and social potentialities still to be transformed into realities. The people of Guiana have been given to an effective extent basic control over their own destiny. It is up to them now to prove by the use of their new power that they can justify demands for full self-government which could lay sound foundations for the Caribbean nationhood they might be privileged to share.

Rawle Farley and Colin Hughes.

Guide to Books

Overseas Settlement

By G. F. Plant (Oxford University Press. 16s.)

The British Settlement of Natal

By Professor Alan F. Hattersley. (Cambridge University Press. 18s.)

Ever since Bacon wrote, in his *Essay on Plantations*, 'When the Plantation grows in strength, then it is time to Plant with Women as well as with Men: That the Plantation may spread with Generations and not be ever peeced from without,' the story of British Oversea Settlement has illustrated the truth of his contention. Governmental emigration policy has always tended towards some contemporary expediency and to have insufficient regard for the long-term view that the only successful settlement is one based on the attraction of better prospects for the individual settler. It is significant that the permanent mass movements to such countries as Canada, Australia, and New Zealand have been spontaneous and largely unaided by State schemes.

Dominion statesmen visiting this country since the end of the last war have often criticised the lukewarmness of the British Government towards their proposals for population accretions. They have laid great stress on the defence needs of the Commonwealth and the importance of dispersal when they would have done better to concentrate on other arguments addressed directly to the average British family. The best answer to their special pleading is to be found in the Report of the Royal Commission on Population, which points out that a considerable density of population has become an indispensable condition of industrial proficiency and a basic element in its military strength, and that, having regard to the increase in the proportion of older and dependent people, a replacement size of family in Great Britain is desirable. Full employment and the attractions of the Welfare State have become the main obstacles to emigration and future schemes for any considerable settlement will have to guarantee at least comparable conditions to ensure success.

His long experience as Secretary of the Oversea Settlement Board and the Committee which preceded it, has enabled Mr. Plant to present a full and objective survey of the history of British migration from earliest times to the present day, but even more valuable are his conclusions as to future policy. He feels that funds available under the Empire Settlement Act would be more usefully employed in development plans in which emigrants could employ their existing skills than in the immediate organisation of land settlement schemes. Reciprocity of social services, general reduced passage rates and an extension of the nomination system are recommended rather than the mass migrations to 'new towns' which have been suggested in some quarters to counteract the danger of draining away the adventurous and youthful from Britain.

Professor Hattersley's latest book is necessarily of a more limited scope and was written in connection with the centenary celebrations of the first organised emigration to Natal. Although it is of particular interest to the descendants of the settlers whose careers are traced in painstaking detail, his study of the causes of the movement and the relations of the newcomers both with the Zulus and the Bantu refugees make fascinating reading. The insistence of the early colonial government on its plans to give industrial training to the natives, and the

distribution of seed to them when cotton had been abandoned by the whites, might have changed the course of Afro-European relations, had the soil proved kinder.

F. W. Skinnard.

Ideas and Ideals of the British Empire

By Sir Ernest Barker. (Cambridge University Press. 5s.)

In this second edition Sir Ernest Barker brings his short constitutional history of the Commonwealth, as his publishers tell us, 'up to date as far as possible.' This is an interesting and scholarly little book. It traces the development of the ideas of liberty of the subject, of the representative principle and of 'trust' and examines how far 'a mission of culture,' implicit in the classical conception of empire, has been fulfilled by the British in modern times.

Unfortunately, however, the scholar's approach seems to preclude any serious discussion of the vital issues facing the Commonwealth to-day. The author fails to provide a satisfactory *raison d'être* for a Commonwealth no longer united 'by a common allegiance to the Crown' and now hardly more than a functional association, unable to settle its own internal disputes (e.g., Kashmir) and clearly divided on issues of racial discrimination. He is also a little complacent about how faithfully the principle of the advancement of the liberty and well-being of the native populations has been obeyed; and when we read that in Malaya, the system of Indirect Rule 'is said to have reached its highest development' we may well pause and wonder. The Epilogue seems a little dated and might have paid tribute to the unique achievements of the last six years. And the index is unsatisfactory.

Nevertheless Sir Ernest Barker provides thought-provoking reading and the book is reasonably priced at five shillings.

W. T. Rodgers.

SHORT NOTICES

An Eminent and Unconventional Victorian by A. C. Cooke. (Reprint from University of Toronto Quarterly Volume XX, No. 4, July, 1951.) An article on Mary Kingsley, who went to West Africa in 1893, despite discouragement from her friends—'Oh, you can't possibly go there' one said, 'that's where Sierra Leone is, the white man's grave, you know. Deadliest spot on earth.' This extraordinary woman came to understand the Africans, saying 'We gradually educated each other, and I had the best of the affair; for all I had got to teach them was that I was only a beetle and fetish hunter . . . while they had to teach me a new world.' Her strictures on British policy were very severe.

The Changing Commonwealth. Edited by F. H. Soward. (Oxford University Press. 16s.) This is an edited version of the proceedings of the Fourth Unofficial Commonwealth Relations Conference held at Bigwin Inn, Ontario in September, 1949. It records shortened and anonymous reports of the delegates' speeches on economic and strategic problems, the relations of member nations to UNO and the future of the Commonwealth. There are a number of interesting paragraphs summarising a debate on racial discrimination, but on the whole colonial questions receive rather inadequate attention.

Parliament

Northern Rhodesian Immigration. Mr. John Hynd asked how many Afrikaners from South Africa entered during the last three years as immigrants; how many of these were skilled workers; and how many were carrying out the work of overseers in place of Africans. Mr. Lennox-Boyd (Minister of State for the Colonies) replied that no statistics had been kept to show the number of immigrants speaking any given language. The information requested was therefore not available. The following figures showed the number of immigrants who entered Northern Rhodesia in recent years:

	Total number of immigrants	Persons born in South Africa
1948	5,516	2,392
1949	6,533	3,146
1950	7,390	4,178
1951 (1 Jan. to 30 June)	3,644	1,956

It has been estimated that 50 per cent. of immigration from South Africa was offset by re-emigration and that 25 per cent. of immigration from the United Kingdom was similarly offset. (December 6.)

African Farmers' Improvement Fund in Northern Rhodesia. Mr. John Hynd asked what was the total amount of money in this Fund at the latest date; how many Africans had received the bonus of 15s. per acre from this fund. In reply, Mr. Lennox-Boyd said that at the 31st December, 1950, there was £138,794 in the fund. During the season 1950-51 445 farmers qualified for the bonus. (December 6.)

Tanganyika: Removal of Meru Families. In reply to questions by Mr. John Hynd and Mr. Sorensen, Mr. Lennox-Boyd said that under a scheme which had been accepted by the native authorities and publicly announced two years ago, 350 families were to be removed by free transport, with compensation for disturbance, to land adjoining the area occupied by the rest of the tribe. This had been specially prepared for them by the Tanganyika Government by the installation of piped water supplies, bore holes and cattle dips. The families removed would be given free food while establishing themselves. As part of the same scheme a considerable area of land had been acquired for the use of the tribe. This land had been formerly alienated to Europeans and some of it had been acquired by compulsory purchase, for the use of the tribe. The area to be vacated would be leased for large-scale cattle-ranching. The numbers likely to be thus employed could not yet be estimated. In spite of the acceptance of the scheme by the native authority some degree of compulsion had been necessary to complete the scheme of re-allocation which was of unquestionable benefit to the Meru Tribe and to the economic development of the territory. Everything had been done to secure the consent of the individual tribesmen concerned. Action could no longer be delayed but no measures would be taken beyond the minimum necessary to secure the objective in view. In reply to supplementary questions, Mr. Lennox-Boyd said that Europeans would probably develop the vacated land but that he would strongly deprecate the introduction of any racial consideration. The future of the territory, like so many others, lay in a partnership between various people and those Members who rightly set store by the interests of Africans would

help them by encouraging the development of this new partnership. Mr. Griffiths added that it was important to make clear that the land that had been compulsorily acquired from the Europeans on which to settle the Africans was very much better land. (December 5.)

Police Interrogation in Malaya. Mr. Driberg asked what enquiries had been made into the methods used by police officers in interrogating suspects; and with what result. In reply, Mr. Lennox-Boyd said that there had been many wild accusations of ill-treatment and that it was clearly in the Communist interest to propagate such stories. Any specific allegations had been carefully investigated, and in the few cases where cause had been shown, stern action had been taken. In a supplementary, Mr. Driberg asked that the Secretary of State during his visit to Malaya should be requested to investigate this subject with particular reference to the removal of detainees from detention camps for interrogation at C.I.D. headquarters, about which there had been a number of disquieting and not in the least wild reports in such responsible newspapers as *The Times*. (December 5.)

Rural and Industrial Development Authority of Malaya. Mr. Awbery asked what progress had been made by R.I.D.A., what was the total of the loans which had been made to relieve the poverty of the Malayan peasants and fishermen by assisting marketing and credit co-operatives. Mr. Lennox-Boyd replied that he would send a copy of the first progress report up to the end of June. Mr. Awbery added in a supplementary question, that in Ceylon co-operative producing, marketing and consumer schemes had been working with great satisfaction and that this was the best way of protecting the peasants and fishermen from exploitation and would the Minister of State stress the importance of this form of assistance to R.I.D.A. Mr. Lennox-Boyd replied that if real value was to come from this highly valuable development it must come by building carefully and patiently, and that the Government would be very glad indeed to profit from the admirable example of Ceylon. (December 5.)

U.K. Gifts to the Colonial Empire. In reply to a question by Mr. Reid, Mr. Lennox-Boyd stated that grants made to British dependencies and mandated territories and expenditure incurred on their behalf from 1919 to 1945 totalled approximately £161m. The sums that had been given or promised since 1945 amounted to £254½m. approximately, of which over £123m. had been issued by 31st October, 1951. He added that during the war the Colonies gave to the U.K. cash gifts alone amounting to over £24m. (December 3.)

Overcrowding of Prisons in Jamaica. Mr. Sorensen asked what steps had been taken to deal with an overcrowding that amounted in some instances to 50, 60 and sometimes 70 per cent. above what the numbers should be. Mr. Lennox-Boyd, in reply, said that the Government of Jamaica had sought to relieve overcrowding by the construction of additional buildings in the existing prisons and of a new "open" prison for 200 first offenders, and that it was hoped that overcrowding would diminish partly through the provision of new facilities and partly through the decline in the amount of crime. (November 28.)

THE I.C.F.T.U. AND THE COLONIES

The Executive Board of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions met at Brussels at the end of November. Amongst the resolutions passed, there was an important declaration on non-self-governing territories:—

1. We demand and support the adoption and implementation of policies and programmes aiming at the earliest and greatest possible political, social and economic advancement of all dependent territories and protectorates as well as of measures for the rapid realisation of self-government and self-determination on the part of all peoples.

2. We demand that time-tables be set for the achievement of full self-government and self-determination of dependent territories and protectorates which are reasonably advanced in their political development.

3. We hold that all non-self-governing territories should be supervised by the United Nations under a régime similar to that prescribed for trust territories by the Charter of the United Nations.

4. We claim that it is the duty of the metropolitan countries to do everything in their power to further the political, social and economic development of their dependencies and to provide facilities for training members of the indigenous population for administrative, commercial, industrial and other positions of responsibility.

5. We claim furthermore that the metropolitan countries must accept their obligation to develop the social rights of, and a system of social security for, the indigenous population.

6. We urge that non-self-governing territories be granted the status of associate membership in the International Labour Organisation, and that they be associated with the work of the United Nations and of the Economic and Social Council in particular. (As a means of achieving this, technical advisers from non-self-governing territories should be included in delegations of metropolitan countries to the United Nations General Assembly and Economic and Social Council.)

7. We are of the opinion that the metropolitan countries have no right to monopolise the commercial relations of their dependencies and that a free exchange of commodities with foreign countries should be encouraged.

8. We demand that the interests and views of the indigenous population shall be of prime concern in the formulation of measures leading to self-government. Wherever the indigenous population is in the majority, their right to govern the country as they think fit should be recognised as self-government develops; but we hold that the democratic rights of other parts of the population should be respected at all times.

9. We support popular movements in non-self-governing territories aspiring to attain the objects set out above, provided that they are pledged to work for the establishment of a democratic society, to uphold the principles of free trade unionism and that they are unequivocally opposed to totalitarianism in any form. Where free trade unions are in existence, we support them as the most important force for democratic development.

The Executive Board also heard a number of reports on activities in colonial territories. The Regional Activities Fund has now nearly reached its original target of £250,000. The British T.U.C. had already exceeded its guaranteed minimum contribution of £100,000, and during the course of the meeting the American Congress of Industrial Organisations' cheque for \$100,000 was paid in by Victor Reuther. The Executive Board approved detailed allocations from the Fund for the Asian regional office, for the foundation and running of the residential training college in Asia, for the establishment of a West African office at Accra and educational activities in West Africa, and for education and organisational purposes in North and East Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean.

In the Asian college, emphasis will be on training for practical day-to-day activities, rather than on academic studies, and educational sub-centres are to be opened, beginning with one at Singapore. Two residential training courses lasting six weeks are planned for West Africa, and correspondence courses are being prepared in collaboration with Ruskin College, Oxford. The I.C.F.T.U. is co-operating with U.N.E.S.C.O. in a number of schemes for adult and workers' education, which include a regional seminar in Jamaica in 1952 and one later for Asia.

Applications for affiliation to the I.C.F.T.U. from a number of colonial trade unions were accepted, including the Singapore Trade Union Congress, the British Guiana Trade Union Council and four Trinidad unions.

CONTENTS FOR THIS NUMBER

For Reference	January, 1952
Comment—	
South-West African Disaster - - - -	1
Tshekedi Goes Home - - - -	1
What is a Minister? - - - -	2
Partnership - - - -	2
'Foreign Firms' - - - -	3
Higher Education - - - -	3
Help for Underdeveloped Countries:	
By H. Castens - - - -	4
What is Partnership? - - - -	6
Opinion - - - -	8
El Dorado's New Constitution - - - -	9
Guide to Books - - - -	10
Parliament - - - -	11
I.C.F.T.U. and the Colonies - - - -	12

FABIAN
COLONIAL BUREAU
 11 Dartmouth Street, London, SW1
 Annual Subscription to Bureau . . 20s.
 (including Venture)
 Full-time Students' Subscription . 10s.
 Annual Subscription to Venture only 7/6d.
 Further details of membership from the Secretary